

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action having a mailing date of May 18, 2005. Claims 1-14 are pending in the present Application. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6. Consequently, claims 1-14 remain pending in the present Application.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 6 to recite that the password is provided utilizing a basic input output system (BIOS) for the computer system. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification, page 1, line 14-page 2, line 17 (indicating the PARTIES partition is accessible via BIOS) and page 5, line 13-page 6, line 10 (indicating the recited partition may be a PARTIES) partition.

This application is under Final Rejection. Applicant has presented arguments hereinbelow that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the Amendment to clarify issues upon appeal.

In the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art (AAPA) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin TDB-ACC-NO: NN9611103 (Bulletin). In so doing, the Examiner acknowledged that the AAPA does not teach allowing a password to be provided for each of the plurality of sub-partitions, the password being required for a user to utilize a corresponding sub-partition as a boot source. Instead, the Examiner relied upon the Bulletin for this teaching.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Independent claim 1 recites a method for providing a trusted boot source, which allows a plurality of sub-partitions to be defined for the partition, and provides a password for each of the sub-partitions. The password is

required for a user to utilize a corresponding sub-partition as a boot source. Furthermore, the password is queried for using the BIOS. Claim 6 recites an analogous computer system.

The AAPA in view of the Bulletin fail to teach or suggest utilizing the BIOS for providing a password for sub-partition(s). As the Examiner has acknowledged, while the AAPA describes booting from different sub-partitions, the AAPA fails to teach or suggest the use of passwords. The Bulletin does describe the use of passwords for booting partitions. In particular, the Bulletin uses passwords to address the problem of children accessing the parents' partition and "modify[ing] or corrupt[ing] programs or data." Bulletin, paragraph 1, lines 9-10. Bulletin, paragraph 1, lines 14-15. However, the Bulletin expressly states that the passwords are handled using a boot manager that requests a password when the user selects a partition. Bulletin, paragraph 2, lines 1-3. Thus, the Bulletin functions by providing a Boot Manager for entering a password for access to a partition.

Although the Bulletin functions well for its intended purpose, the AAPA in view of the Bulletin fails to teach or suggest the method and computer system recited in claims 1 and 6, respectively. In particular, the AAPA in view of the Bulletin fails to teach or suggest allowing a password to be provided for each of the plurality of sub-partitions utilizing a BIOS for the computer system. If the Bulletin is combined with the AAPA, the combination might add a boot manager using the teachings of the Bulletin to the AAPA. The boot manager would be used to obtain the appropriate password for the partition. Because a boot manager is used, Applicant respectfully submits that booted code from the hardfile would be used to request a password and validate the password provided.

In contrast, the method and system recited in claims 1 and 6 utilize the BIOS to obtain a password and determine whether the partition or sub-partition is accessible. A separate boot

manager that may query the user later in the boot process is not necessary. Instead, the password is handled utilizing the BIOS. The AAPA in view of the Bulletin thus fail to teach or suggest the method and computer system recited in claims 1 and 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-5, and 11-12 depend upon claim 1. Claims 7-10, and 13-14 depend upon claim 6. Consequently, the arguments herein apply with full force to claims 2-5, and 7-14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5 and 7-14 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant's attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 18, 2005
Date

/Janyce R. Mitchell/ Reg. No. 40,095
Janyce R. Mitchell
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(650) 493-4540